

• Based on the draw down of
FS how should the Air Guard be
impacted

How ~~to~~ will the AF make preparation
in the future

What will happen to old assets that
the Guard has

Val var la

- If sizes - need more analysis
- ... what is size you would recommend
- With the expected draw down CMA
we still have a fly unit in every
State that will support state requirements

* It seem like the Homeland Security is a much larger issue with no written requirements.

2004 - Acted on 99 Requests
2005 - Acted on 20 Requests

NORTH EAST

DOD is totally responsible for Homeland Defense

Homeland Security is a part of DOD responsibility
OAS center HQ

- please comment on the W & Pacific NW
Will make it more secure

Northwest command → Northern
600 Combatant command → North American

unacceptable Risk

- Right Size of Force
Hard to give a credible

• Tankers need to be wearing
or Deployment Routes

- What Responsibility do you have to the Home land security & State Requirements
- If you had to do it all over again what what would change
- Complex Layered Defense
- Civil Air Patrol
NO we do not need to think about them.

• Reduction of total FS + SQ in the Active not the Guard.

• What Does the efficiency of the Size of the SFC

**Excerpts from Governors' Letters and Press Releases
Concerns about Air National Guard Recommendations**

Cited Legal Precedence and No Consent

Delaware

On May 25, 2005, I sent a letter to Secretary Rumsfeld advising him that, as Governor of the State of Delaware, I do not consent to the Department of Defense's (DoD) BRAC recommendations to realign the Delaware Air National Guard New Castle County Air Base. I am writing to you today to provide legal documentation supporting the Governor's role as Commander in Chief of the Delaware National Guard and the requiring the DoD to confer with the Governor on matters pertaining to the National Guard. I hope you consider these factors as you continue an open and transparent review of the DoD's recommendations.

Pennsylvania

Gov. Edward G. Rendell, along with Sens. Arlen Specter and Rick Santorum, today announced the commencement of legal action to prevent the Department of Defense (DoD) from deactivating the 111th Fighter Wing of the Pennsylvania Air National Guard stationed at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania.

The action arises under the "militia clause" of the United States Constitution, art. I, sec. 8, cl. 16, 10 U.S.C. § 18238 and 32 U.S.C. § 104, which provides, in part, that a National Guard unit may not be changed, relocated or withdrawn without the approval of the governor of the state in which the unit is located. Gov. Rendell has not consented, and indicated at the July 7, 2005, BRAC Commission hearing that he will not consent to the deactivation of the 111th Fighter Wing.

Ohio

I have been disturbed, however, by a number of the recommendations regarding Air National Guard assets and, in particular, by the process through which the Air Force arrived at their recommendations. The Air Force did not in any way consult with the States or the Adjutants General. The Air Force committed a number of substantial deviations from the BRAC statutes, which the 178th Fighter Wing (Springfield, OH) and the 179th Airlift Wing (Mansfield, OH) reported in extraordinarily detail. I urge the Commission to review those reports and reject the Air Force recommendations.

West Virginia

More critically, 32 U.S.C. Sec. 104(c) forbids a change in the organization or allocation of a National Guard unit located entirely within a State without the approval of its governor. As Governor of the State of West Virginia, I do not consent to the proposed realignment of C-130H planes from the 130th Airlift Wing. Absent such consent, the proposed change in the branch, organization, or allotment of the Yeager Airport Air Guard Station would contravene federal law.

Alaska

Accordingly, pursuant to the 'militia clause' of the United States Constitution, art. I, sec. 8, cl. 16, and the above referenced statutory provisions, my consent is necessary for the actions contemplated by the Department of Defense with regard to the 176th Wing at Kulis National Guard Base and the 168th Air Refueling Wing located on Eielson Air Force Base. Because the Department of Defense did not obtain my consent, the actions proposed by your department cannot proceed. I am aware that the State of Pennsylvania has already filed suit alleging the same arguments and several other affected states are considering following suit. I will be closely monitoring these proceedings and will take similar action if necessary. By this letter I wish to formally notify you that I will continue to withhold my consent to the proposed realignment of Kulis Air National Guard Base in Anchorage and the "warm storage" of Eielson Air Force Base until I receive assurances that the mission of the 'Air National Guard will not be compromised in Alaska.

Connecticut

In my June 14, 2005 letter to Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, I provided formal notification of my objection to the Commission's recommendation to "realign" the 103rd Fighter Wing, Connecticut Air National Guard, located at the Bradley International Airport, in East Granby, Connecticut. In my letter to Secretary Rumsfeld I reiterated that the Department of Defense did not coordinate its recommendation with the State of Connecticut and that no federal official contacted my office or the Connecticut Adjutant General to discuss any federal proposal concerning Air National Guard units or assets located in Connecticut. At no time have I given my consent to any changes with regard to Air National Guard units in the State of Connecticut.

Illinois

The Department of Defense did not coordinate this recommendation with either my office or the Illinois Adjutant General. This lack of consultation compromises the integrity of the process used to develop the BRAC recommendations and completely disregards my role as Commander-in-Chief of the Illinois National Guard. Further, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. §18238 and 32 U.S.C. §104(c), my consent is necessary for the actions contemplated by the Department of Defense with regard to the 183rd Fighter Wing.

Mississippi

Neither I nor my Adjutant General were consulted about the proposed realignment of the 186 Air National Guard Air Refueling Wing at Key field, Meridian, MS in the Base Closure and Realignment process. Respectfully, I ask that it be withdrawn.

Montana

Besides my concerns over how the Commission's process adheres to its own legal criteria for evaluating realignment and closure of bases and units and the soundness of the decision making, I want to insure that other federal laws are followed to the letter so that costly and protracted litigation between the Department of Defense and the State of Montana might be avoided. Both Titles 10 and 32 of the United States Code require the consent of each impacted state's Governor.

Michigan

I am writing to advise you officially that, as Governor of Michigan, I do not consent to the deactivation, relocation, or withdrawal of the 110th Fighter Wing or the retirement of the F-16s from the 127th Wing.

These Department of Defense recommendations have not been coordinated with me, my Adjutant General, or members of his staff. No one in authority of the Michigan Air National Guard was consulted or even briefed about this recommended action before it was announced publicly.

Oregon

I am writing to advise you officially that, as Governor of Oregon, I do not consent to the deactivation, relocation or withdrawal of the 142nd Fighter Wing. Further, pursuant to 10 D.S.C. §18238 and 32 D.S.C. §104(c), my consent is necessary for the Department of Defense to implement the recommended actions regarding the 142nd Fighter Wing.

Washington

These recommendations appear to violate 10 U.S.C. Section 18238 and 32 U.S.C Section 104(c) which require the Governor's consent for such actions. I do not consent to the realignment of the 141st Air Refueling Wing or to removal, relocation, or reassignment of the 141st's unit equipped primary assigned KC-135 aircraft. The proposal materially interferes with the right of the state to maintain an organized state militia pursuant to the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution.

General Concerns About the Guard

Maryland

As we discussed, I question the proposed shifts of Air Guard assets. Accordingly, I appreciate your including Maryland Adjutant General Bruce Tuxill in our meeting. Like many other Governors around the nation, I am concerned with the impact that the proposed shifts will have on our readiness and response capabilities. This issue is especially sensitive in the National Capital Region. I am confident that the invaluable feedback you have gathered during the course of your hearings and meetings will be of great help as you begin to address these concerns.

New York

Considering the potential incursion of potential terrorists entities coming in from abroad, we are unsure and troubled as to why the Air Force has decided to take planes, missions, and jobs away from so many Air Guard and Air Reserve bases and put them on more costly Active Duty bases. We firmly believe that it would be extremely detrimental to national and state Homeland Security interests, and jeopardize the enormous strides taken to protect and secure our borders.

Texas

This letter is to express my strong concern regarding the Department of Defense (DoD) proposal to retire the F-16C fighter aircraft located at Ellington Field in Houston, Texas. Currently assigned to the 147 Fighter Wing, Texas Air National Guard, these aircraft represent the only true Air Force rapid reaction capability for protection of the critical infrastructure and key resources along the Texas Gulf Coast - a capability that must be preserved. My position on the retention of the 147th Fighter Wing at Ellington is underscored by the DoD's recently published (June 2005) *Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support*.